

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-2014

EUGENE GRAY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WILLIAM S. COHEN, Honorable, Secretary Department of Defense; U. S. DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY; RICHARD E. BEALE, Executive Director, in his individual and official capacity; CROSBY JOHNSON, Director of Contracts, in his individual and official capacity; VICKIE ARCHILLETTI, Manager, Contracts Business Unit, in her individual and official capacity; LARRY HAHN, Director, Contract Equipment Division, in his individual and official capacity; HAROLD WHITE, Supervisor, Contract Equipment Branch, in his individual and official capacity; ARAM DARAKAJUIAN, Supervisor, Personnel Relations Specialist, in his individual and official capacity; PHIL KOREN, General Counsel, in his individual and official capacity; JOHN SCHERE, II, General Counsel, in his individual and official capacity; KATHY HAWTHORNE, Contract Specialist, in her individual and official capacity; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF VIRGINIA; JOEL SILVERMAN, Doctor, in his individual and official capacity,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, District Judge. (CA-99-255-3)

Submitted: January 29, 2004

Decided: February 4, 2004

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eugene Gray, Appellant Pro Se. M. Hannah Lauck, Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Eugene Gray appeals the district court's order denying as untimely his motion to reconsider a prior order dismissing his civil action. Our review of the record and the district court's opinion discloses no reversible error. Accordingly, although we grant Gray's motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal, we deny Gray's motion for a stay and affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Gray v. Cohen, No. CA-99-255-3 (E.D. Va. June 12, 2003). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED